Short Range Correlations and the EMC Effect in Effective Field Theory

Jiunn-Wei Chen,[1,2,*] William Detmold,[2,†] Joel E. Lynn,[3,4,‡] and Achim Schwenk[3,4,5,§]

[1] *Department of Physics, CTS and LeCosPA, National Taiwan University, Taipei 10617, Taiwan*
[2] *Center for Theoretical Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA*
[3] *Institut für Kernphysik, Technische Universität Darmstadt, 64289 Darmstadt, Germany*
[4] *ExtreMe Matter Institute EMMI, GSI Helmholtzzentrum für Schwerionenforschung GmbH, 64291 Darmstadt, Germany*
[5] *Max-Planck-Institut für Kernphysik, Saupfercheckweg 1, 69117 Heidelberg, Germany*

We show that the empirical linear relation between the magnitude of the EMC effect in deep inelastic scattering on nuclei and the short range correlation scaling factor a_2 extracted from high-energy quasi-elastic scattering at $x \geq 1$ is a natural consequence of scale separation and derive the relationship using effective field theory. While the scaling factor a_2 is a ratio of nuclear matrix elements that depend on the calculational scheme, we show that the ratio is independent of this choice. We perform Green's function Monte Carlo calculations with both chiral and Argonne-Urbana potentials to verify this and determine the scaling factors for light nuclei. The resulting values for ^{3}He and ^{4}He are in good agreement with experimental values. We also present results for ^{9}Be and ^{12}C extracted from variational Monte Carlo calculations.

arXiv:1607.03065v1 [hep-ph] 11 Jul 2016

Introduction: Deep Inelastic Scattering (DIS) of leptons on hadrons can be precisely described as high-energy (perturbative) lepton-quark scattering weighted by the parton distribution functions (PDFs) that describe the probability of finding a quark or gluon inside the hadron. DIS has been used to map out the quark and gluon parton distributions for the proton and subsequently nuclei. In recent years, these experiments have revealed new and intriguing glimpses of nuclear structure that we seek to derive using effective field theory (EFT) methods.

In 1983, the European Muon Collaboration [1] measured the structure functions $F_2^A(x, Q^2)$ describing DIS for iron and deuterium targets, where Bjorken $x = Q^2/(2p\cdot q)$ and $Q^2 = -q^2$ are defined in terms of the target four-momentum p and the momentum transfer from the lepton to the target, q. The results of these experiments could not be explained by nuclear structure (i.e., momentum distribution of nucleons inside the nucleus) without modifying the nucleon structure [1]. This "EMC effect" was unexpected since the typical binding energy per nucleon is so much smaller (<1%) than the nucleon mass and the energy transfer involved in a DIS process. The EMC effect has now been mapped out for DIS on targets ranging from helium to lead (see Refs. [2–6] for reviews) and similar medium modifications of parton structure have been investigated in other reactions [5, 7]. The picture that has emerged is that the ratio

$$R_{\rm EMC}(A,x) = \frac{2F_2^A(x,Q^2)}{AF_2^d(x,Q^2)}, \tag{1}$$

with A the atomic number and d the deuteron, can deviate from unity by up to 20% over the range $0.05 < x < 0.7$. The ratio has very little dependence on Q^2 and so we suppress it. Experimental data also suggest that for an isoscalar nucleus, the x and A dependence of $R_{EMC} - 1$ is factorizable. That is, the shape of the deviation of $R_{\rm EMC}$ from unity is independent of A while the magnitude of the deviation depends only on A [8, 9]. $R_{\rm EMC}$ forms a straight line in intermediate x, and one can express the magnitude of the EMC effect by the slope $dR_{\rm EMC}(A,x)/dx$ for $0.35 \leq x \leq 0.7$. Since Bjorken x is defined with respect to the parent nucleon of the struck parton, it is bounded in the range $0 \leq x \leq A$.

In recent experiments at Jefferson Lab, it was found that the ratio of quasi-elastic (QE) scattering cross sections,

$$a_2(A,x) \equiv \left.\frac{2\sigma_A}{A\sigma_d}\right|_{1.5<x<2}, \tag{2}$$

forms an x-independent plateau with negligible Q^2 dependence for targets from ^{3}He to ^{197}Au [10–14]. This factor a_2 is referred to as the short range correlation (SRC) scaling factor as it necessarily probes coherent multi-nucleon effects inside the nucleus. A remarkable empirical discovery is that the EMC slope and the SRC scaling factor a_2 are linearly related [15, 16].

In this Letter, we explain this linear relationship using EFT and compute a_2 in light nuclei. We first review the EFT description of the EMC effect of Ref. [17] which explained the factorization of x and A dependence of $R_{\rm EMC} - 1$, and then show that the linear relation follows naturally from this, albeit in limited kinematic domains. Factorization also shows that a_2 is scheme and scale independent even though it arises from scheme- and scale-dependent matrix elements in different nuclei. Finally, the values of a_2 for ^{3}He and ^{4}He are computed using the Green's function Monte Carlo (GFMC) method with both chiral and Argonne-Urbana potentials to confirm the scheme and scale independence and are compared with data, showing close agreement. Results for ^{9}Be and ^{12}C extracted from variational Monte Carlo (VMC) calculations [18] are also discussed.

EFT Analysis: Chiral EFT is constructed based on the chiral symmetry of QCD. It has been successfully applied to many aspects of meson [19], single [20], and multi-nucleon systems [21]. In particular, chiral EFT has

been applied to PDFs in the meson and single-nucleon [22–27] and multi-nucleon sectors [17, 28] as well as to other light-cone dominated observables [29–33].

The structure functions describing lepton-nucleus DIS, $F_2^A(x,Q^2)$, can be expressed in terms of nuclear PDFs $q_i^A(x,Q)$ (for simplicity of presentation, we choose the DIS scheme where the renormalization and factorization scale are set equal to the hard scale of DIS, $\mu=\mu_f=Q$, although the results below do not depend on the scheme) as $F_2^A(x,Q^2)=\sum_i Q_i^2 x\; q_i^A(x,Q)$, where the sum is over quarks and anti-quarks of flavor i of charge $\pm Q_i$ in a nucleus A. In what follows, we focus on the isoscalar PDFs, $q^A=q_u^A+q_d^A$; in the relevant experiments, nuclear PDFs are typically "corrected" for isospin asymmetry of the targets. The dominant (leading-twist) parton distributions are determined by target matrix elements of bilocal light-cone operators. Applying the operator product expansion, the Mellin moments of the parton distributions,

$$\langle x^n\rangle_A(Q)=\int_{-A}^{A} x^n q_A(x,Q)dx, \tag{3}$$

are determined by matrix elements of local operators,

$$\langle A;p|\mathcal{O}^{\mu_0\cdots\mu_n}|A;p\rangle=\langle x^n\rangle_A(Q)\,p^{(\mu_0}\ldots p^{\mu_n)} \tag{4}$$

with

$$\mathcal{O}^{\mu_0\cdots\mu_n}=\overline{q}\gamma^{(\mu_0}iD^{\mu_1}\cdots iD^{\mu_n)}q, \tag{5}$$

where (...) indicates that enclosed indices have been symmetrized and made traceless and $D^\mu=(\overrightarrow{D}^\mu-\overleftarrow{D}^\mu)/2$ is the covariant derivative.

In EFT, each of the QCD operators is matched to hadronic operators [17]

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{O}^{\mu_0\cdots\mu_n}\to&\langle x^n\rangle_N M^n v^{(\mu_0}\cdots v^{\mu_n)}N^\dagger N\left[1+\alpha_n N^\dagger N\right],\\&+\langle x^n\rangle_\pi \pi^\alpha i\partial^{(\mu_0}\cdots i\partial^{\mu_n)}\pi^\alpha+\ldots,\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where $N\,(\pi)$ is the nucleon (pion) field, v is the nucleon four velocity and $\langle x^n\rangle_{N(\pi)}$ is the nth moment of the isoscalar quark PDF in a free nucleon (pion). The $\langle x^n\rangle_{N\,(\pi)}$ terms are one-body operators acting on a single hadron only, while the α_n terms are two-body operators. Here we have only kept the SU(4) (spin and isospin) singlet two-body operator $\propto\left(N^\dagger N\right)^2$ and neglected the SU(4) non-singlet operator $\propto(N^\dagger\boldsymbol{\sigma}N)^2-(N^\dagger\boldsymbol{\tau}N)^2$ which changes sign when interchanging the spin ($\boldsymbol{\sigma}$) and isospin ($\boldsymbol{\tau}$) matrices [34]. The latter operator has an additional $O(1/N_c^2)\sim 0.1$ suppression in its prefactor [35] with N_c the number of colors. It is also a good approximation to replace the nucleon velocity by the nucleus velocity.

The relative importance of the hadronic operators of Eq. (6) in a nuclear matrix element can be systematically estimated from the power counting of the EFT, which assigns a power of the small expansion parameter $\epsilon\sim m_\pi/\Lambda$, P/Λ (with P the typical momentum in the problem and $\Lambda\sim 0.5$ GeV the range of validity of the EFT) to each Feynman diagram. In Weinberg's power counting scheme [36], the nucleon one-body operator is $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-3})$, the nucleon two-body operator is $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^0)$, while the pion one-body operator connecting two nucleons is $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{2n})$. Since $\langle x^0\rangle_\pi=0$ (the total quark number is zero in a pion), the pion operator will not contribute until $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$ hence it is higher order compared with the other operators in Eq. (6). The same order of importance for these operators is also found using the power counting of Ref. [37], but with a less suppressed two-body effect compared with the one-body nucleon operator. Other higher dimensional operators are omitted here because they are higher order in the power counting [17].

Using nucleon number conservation, $\langle A|N^\dagger N|A\rangle=A$, the nuclear matrix element of Eq. (6) is

$$\langle x^n\rangle_A(Q)=\langle x^n\rangle_N(Q)\Big[A+\alpha_n(\Lambda,Q)\langle A|(N^\dagger N)^2|A\rangle_\Lambda\Big], \tag{7}$$

where α_n is A independent but Λ dependent and is completely determined by the two-nucleon system. This relation is valid for all n, so after an inverse Mellin transform, the isoscalar PDFs satisfy

$$q_A(x,Q)/A=q_N(x,Q)+g_2(A,\Lambda)\tilde{q}_2(x,Q,\Lambda), \tag{8}$$

where

$$g_2(A,\Lambda)=\frac{1}{A}\langle A|\left(N^\dagger N\right)^2|A\rangle_\Lambda, \tag{9}$$

and $\tilde{q}_2(x,Q,\Lambda)$ is an unknown function independent of A. Here, the factorization scale of the PDF is $\mu_f=Q$, while Λ is the nuclear physics "ultraviolet" cut-off that separates the high energy parton physics from lower energy hadronic and nuclear effects. The two scales must be significantly separated for the EFT description to be valid. Including perturbative QCD running, this result also holds at the level of the structure function,

$$F_2^A(x,Q^2)/A=F_2^N(x,Q^2)+g_2(A,\Lambda)f_2(x,Q^2,\Lambda). \tag{10}$$

Equation (10) was also obtained phenomenologically in Ref. [9] using impulse approximation.

The second term on the right-hand side of Eq. (10) is the nuclear modification of the nucleon structure function F_2^N. The shape of distortion, i.e., the x dependence of f_2, which is due to physics above the scale Λ, is A independent and hence universal among nuclei. The magnitude of distortion, g_2, which is due to physics below the scale Λ, depends only on A and Λ.

Linear EMC-SRC relation in EFT: At smaller Q^2, the analysis in the previous section can be generalized to all the sub-leading terms in the operator product expansion which leads to Eq. (10) again with the Q^2 dependence of F_2^A modified. This implies, as long as

$M\nu, Q^2 \gg \Lambda^2$, the operator product expansion can be resummed to yield

$$\sigma_A/A = \sigma_N + g_2(A,\Lambda)\sigma_2(\Lambda), \tag{11}$$

where the E (initial electron energy), x and Q^2 dependence of σ_i is suppressed. With σ_N vanishing for $x > 1$, for both DIS and QE,

$$a_2(A, x > 1) = \frac{g_2(A,\Lambda)}{g_2(2,\Lambda)}. \tag{12}$$

In principle, a_2 could depend on E, x and Q^2, however the EFT factorization shows that this dependence cancels at this order in the EFT yielding a plateau in a_2 as observed experimentally at $1.5 < x < 2$. (Fermi motion, an $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ effect in the EFT, extends the contribution of the single nucleon PDF to x slightly above 1 so the onset of the plateau is also pushed to larger x.) Since $a_2(A, x)$ is a ratio of physical quantities, it is independent of the EFT cutoff scale Λ, however it arises as the ratio of two scale-dependent quantities, $g_2(A,\Lambda)$ and $g_2(2,\Lambda)$. The EFT analysis therefore predicts that the scale dependence of the matrix element $\langle A| \left(N^\dagger N\right)^2 |A\rangle_\Lambda$ is independent of the nucleus. This will be investigated below.

From Eqs. (1) and (10), direct computation shows the that

$$\frac{dR_{\rm EMC}(A,x)}{dx} = C(x)\left[a_2(A) - 1\right], \tag{13}$$

has a linear relation with a_2, with $C(x) = g_2(2)[f_2' F_2^N - f_2 F_2^{N'}]/[F_2^N + g_2(2) f_2]^2$ independent of A and Λ (here, $f' = df/dx$). There is also a similar relation for the moments

$$\frac{2\langle x^n\rangle_A}{A\langle x^n\rangle_d} - 1 = K_n(a_2 - 1), \tag{14}$$

with $K_n = \alpha_n g_2(2)/(1 + \alpha_n g_2(2))$, also independent of A and Λ.

SRC scaling factor: Short-range correlations in light nuclei have been examined theoretically from several points of view recently [18, 38–41]. One consistent finding of such work is the dominance of np deuteron-like pairs ($ST = 10$) over other pairs at high momentum, which has been observed experimentally [42, 43]. Our results also show this ($ST = 10$)-pair dominance at short distances. However, the focus of previous studies was on the one- or two-body distribution functions in coordinate or momentum space, which are scale and scheme dependent [44, 45].

Here we discuss their observable ratio, the SRC scaling factor, Eq. (12). We calculate a_2 using the GFMC method, which is one of the most accurate methods for solving the many-body Schrödinger equation for nuclei up to $A \le 12$ [46]. The GFMC method projects out the lowest-energy state of a given Hamiltonian H from a trial



FIG. 1. Scaled two-body distribution function $\rho_{2,\mathbf{1}}(A,r)/A$ for $A = 2, 3, 4$ nuclei as a function of relative separation r for chiral two- and three-nucleon interactions at N^{2}LO with two different cutoffs (left panel) and for the AV18+UIX potentials (right panel). In the left panel, the darker (lighter) points are for $R_0 = 1.0$ fm ($R_0 = 1.2$ fm). For $A = 3, 4$ the error bars visible at small r are GFMC statistical uncertainties. The variation of the short-distance behavior of the distributions shows clearly their scale and scheme dependence.

wave function $|\Psi_T\rangle$ via the many-body imaginary-time Green's function

$$\lim_{\tau\to\infty} e^{-H\tau}|\Psi_T\rangle \to |\Psi_0\rangle\,, \tag{15}$$

with τ the imaginary time and $|\Psi_0\rangle$ the exact many-body ground state. A limitation of diffusion Monte Carlo methods is that they require local potentials in practice, while nuclear forces derived from chiral EFT are usually nonlocal. Recently local chiral EFT interactions have been derived up to next-to-next-leading order (N^{2}LO) in Weinberg power counting [47–51]. This enables us to use the GFMC method with chiral EFT as well as phenomenological interactions and to study the scale and scheme independence of a_2.

The expectation value $g_2(A,\Lambda)$, which involves the creation and destruction of a pair of nucleons at zero separation, can be obtained from the isoscalar two-body distribution function

$$\rho_{2,\mathbf{1}}(A,r) = \frac{1}{4\pi r^2}\left\langle \Psi_0 \middle| \sum_{i<j}^{A} \delta(r - |\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|) \middle| \Psi_0 \right\rangle, \tag{16}$$

as a matrix element of a local operator,

$$g_2(A,\Lambda) = \rho_{2,\mathbf{1}}(A, r = 0)/A. \tag{17}$$

In Eq. (16), $\mathbf{r}_i$ is the position of the ith nucleon and the sum runs over all pairs in the nucleus, so that the integral over $\rho_{2,\mathbf{1}}(A,r)$ is normalized to $A(A-1)/2$.

In our GFMC calculations, the two-body distribution function is obtained from a mixed estimate $\langle\Psi_0|\mathcal{O}|\Psi_T\rangle$ as (for details see Ref. [53])

$$\langle\mathcal{O}\rangle \approx 2\frac{\langle\Psi_0|\mathcal{O}|\Psi_T\rangle}{\langle\Psi_0|\Psi_T\rangle} - \frac{\langle\Psi_T|\mathcal{O}|\Psi_T\rangle}{\langle\Psi_T|\Psi_T\rangle}. \tag{18}$$



FIG. 2. Ratio of the two-body distribution functions for ^{3}He (blue) and ^{4}He (red) to the two-body distribution function for the deuteron, $2\rho_{2,\mathbf{1}}(A,r)/A\rho_{2,\mathbf{1}}(2,r)$, as a function of relative separation r. Results are shown for chiral two- and three-nucleon interactions at N^{2}LO with two different cutoffs (left panel) and for the AV18+UIX potentials (middle panel) calculated using the GFMC method. In the left panel, the darker (lighter) points are for $R_0 = 1.0$ fm ($R_0 = 1.2$ fm) and the bands represent a combined uncertainty estimate from the truncation of the chiral expansion added in quadrature to the GFMC statistical uncertainties. The right panel shows the ratio for ^{9}Be (green) and ^{12}C (black) for AV18+UX obtained from VMC results [52]. These ratios are compared to the experimental values for a_2 from Ref. [16], given by the horizontal lines.

We have checked in all cases below that the difference between the mixed estimate and the variational estimate is no more than 5% (15%) of the mixed estimate for the chiral EFT (Argonne-Urbana) interactions. For the SRC scaling factor a_2 we also need the two-body distribution function for the deuteron, $\rho_{2,\mathbf{1}}(A=2,r) = (u^2+w^2)/4\pi r^2$, which is given in terms of the deuteron S- and D-state components (u and w) obtained from an exact solution of the Schrödinger equation.

Figure 1 shows the scaled two-body distribution function $\rho_{2,\mathbf{1}}(A,r)/A$ for $A = 2, 3, 4$ nuclei for chiral two- and three-nucleon interactions at N^{2}LO as well as for the phenomenological Argonne v_{18} (AV18) two-nucleon [54] plus the UIX three-nucleon [55] potentials. The varying behavior of the two-body distributions at small separation r makes clear that $g_2(A,\Lambda)$ depends both on the scheme and scale, where the latter is especially clear from the cutoff dependence ($R_0 = 1.0$ fm vs. $R_0 = 1.2$ fm). Analogous to PDFs, one- and two-body distribution functions depend on the renormalization scheme and scale and hence are not physical quantities [45]. However, the factorization derived in EFT shows the ratio a_2 should be scheme and scale independent.

The SRC scaling factor a_2 is obtained from the ratio of two matrix elements of local operators

$$a_2 = \lim_{r\to 0} \frac{2\,\rho_{2,\mathbf{1}}(A,r)}{A\,\rho_{2,\mathbf{1}}(2,r)}, \tag{19}$$

where we calculate the behavior at $r = 0$ by linearly extrapolating from the smallest two r values to zero separation. In EFT, locality only means a shorter distance than the resolution scale. Hence, we expect one can replace $r \to 0$ in Eq. (19) by smearing within $r < R$ and still get the same a_2.[1] We see indeed this is the case in Fig. 2. The left two panels show a_2 for ^{3}He and ^{4}He calculated using the GFMC method with the chiral N^{2}LO interactions and for the phenomenological AV18+UIX potentials. The right panel shows results extracted from VMC calculations [52] for the AV18+UX potentials for ^{9}Be and ^{12}C. The red and blue bands in the left panel represent a combined uncertainty estimate from the truncation of the chiral expansion [56] added in quadrature to the GFMC statistical uncertainties. We display the band obtained for the $R_0 = 1.0$ fm cutoff which encompasses the N^{2}LO calculations with both cutoffs ($R_0 = 1.0, 1.2$ fm). For each panel, it is clear that a plateau in the ratio sets in at a value R depending on the scale and scheme. Moreover, we observe from Fig. 2 that the $r = 0$ value is a conservative estimate for a_2 given that the statistical uncertainties in the calculation of the two-body distributions grow as we approach zero separation. As is evident from Fig. 2, the GFMC values for a_2 are in very good agreement with experiment [16] while the preliminary VMC results are also encouraging. The experimental extractions of a_2 involve kinematics where the scale separation is marginal, $M\nu, Q^2 \gtrsim \Lambda^2$, and therefore the agreement is somewhat intriguing (note that a_2 could be extracted from a subset of data where Q^2 and ν are large, but with significant statistical uncertainty [57]). We summarize the extracted SRC scaling factors a_2 of the GFMC calculations and the comparison with experiment in Table I.

Summary and outlook: We have shown that the linear relation between the magnitude of the EMC ef-

[1] It is important to note that R and R_0 (the cutoff used in the local chiral EFT interactions) are not necessarily related.

TABLE I. Results for the SRC scaling factor a_2 obtained via Eq. (19) from GFMC calculations of $A = 2, 3, 4$ nuclei based on chiral N^{2}LO interactions (for cutoffs $R_0 = 1.0$ and 1.2 fm) and the AV18+UIX potentials. The uncertainties quoted for the N^{2}LO interactions include the uncertainty estimated from the truncation of the chiral expansion added in quadrature to the GFMC statistical uncertainties.

	N^{2}LO ($R_0 = 1.0 - 1.2$ fm)	AV18+UIX	Exp. [16]
^{3}H	2.1(2) − 2.3(3)	2.0(4)	
^{3}He	2.1(2) − 2.1(3)	2.0(4)	2.13(4)
^{4}He	3.8(7) − 4.2(8)	3.4(3)	3.60(10)

fect at intermediate x and the SRC scaling factor a_2 is a natural consequence of scale separation and have derived this result using EFT. We have also computed a_2 for ^{3}He and ^{4}He using the GFMC method with both chiral and Argonne-Urbana potentials to confirm the scheme and scale independence.

GFMC calculations with chiral interactions for ^{9}Be, ^{12}C and other light nuclei will allow further tests of the EFT understanding of these phenomena. In the case of ^{9}Be, it would be especially interesting to confirm whether a_2 is determined by local instead of global nuclear density [58]. It would also be very insightful to complete our theoretical understanding of the EMC-SRC relation by computing the $C(x)$ coefficient in Eq. (13) from lattice QCD calculations of $f_2(x)$ or the K_n factor of Eq. (14) from the deuteron [59–61].

The EFT approach to the partonic structure of nuclei has broader applicability than to the isoscalar structure that we have discussed above. For the $F_3(x, Q^2)$ structure function that is accessible in weak-current DIS, EFT predicts a relation analogous to Eq. (10) with F_2 replaced by F_3, and g_2 replaced by an isospin-dependent nuclear matrix element. The resulting analogue of Eq. (13) is also expected to hold. The generalization to spin-dependent parton structure and to generalized parton distributions [62] is similarly straight forward. EFT could also shed light on whether a plateau of $\sigma_A/\sigma_{^3\mathrm{He}}$ for $2 < x < 3$ exists, which is still inconclusive experimentally [10, 14, 63], and the dominance of high-energy neutron-proton pairs in two-nucleon knockout measurements in electron nuclear scattering [42, 43].

Acknowledgments: We thank Or Hen, Evgeny Epelbaum, Dean Lee, Ulf-G. Meißner, and Akaki Rusetsky for useful comments and discussions. This work was supported in part by MOST of Taiwan under Grant Nos. 102-2112-M-002-013-MY3 and 105-2918-I-002-003, DOE Early Career Research Award DE-SC0010495, DOE Grant No. DE-SC0011090, and the ERC Grant No. 307986 STRONGINT.

* jwc@phys.ntu.edu.tw
† wdetmold@mit.edu
‡ joel.lynn@gmail.com
§ schwenk@physik.tu-darmstadt.de

[1] J. J. Aubert *et al.* (European Muon Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **123**, 275 (1983).
[2] M. Arneodo, Phys. Rept. **240**, 301 (1994).
[3] D. F. Geesaman, K. Saito, and A. W. Thomas, Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **45**, 337 (1995).
[4] G. Piller and W. Weise, Phys. Rept. **330**, 1 (2000).
[5] P. R. Norton, Rept. Prog. Phys. **66**, 1253 (2003).
[6] O. Hen, D. W. Higinbotham, G. A. Miller, E. Piasetzky, and L. B. Weinstein, Int. J. Mod. Phys. E **22**, 1330017 (2013).
[7] J. C. Peng, P. L. McGaughey, and J. M. Moss, in *RIKEN Symposium and Workshop on Selected Topics in Nuclear Collective Excitations (NUCOLEX 99) Wako, Japan, March 20-24, 1999* (1999) hep-ph/9905447.
[8] S. Daté, K. Saito, H. Sumiyoshi, and H. Tezuka, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 2344 (1984).
[9] L. L. Frankfurt and M. I. Strikman, Phys. Rept. **160**, 235 (1988); Phys. Rept. **76**, 215 (1981).
[10] N. Fomin, J. Arrington, R. Asaturyan, F. Benmokhtar, W. Boeglin, P. Bosted, A. Bruell, M. H. S. Bukhari, M. E. Christy, E. Chudakov, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 092502 (2012).
[11] O. Hen, E. Piasetzky, and L. B. Weinstein, Phys. Rev. **C85**, 047301 (2012), arXiv:1202.3452 [nucl-ex].
[12] L. L. Frankfurt, M. I. Strikman, D. B. Day, and M. Sargsian, Phys. Rev. **C48**, 2451 (1993).
[13] K. S. Egiyan *et al.* (CLAS), Phys. Rev. **C68**, 014313 (2003), arXiv:nucl-ex/0301008 [nucl-ex].
[14] K. S. Egiyan *et al.* (CLAS Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 082501 (2006).
[15] L. B. Weinstein, E. Piasetzky, D. W. Higinbotham, J. Gomez, O. Hen, and R. Shneor, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 052301 (2011).
[16] O. Hen, E. Piasetzky, and L. B. Weinstein, Phys. Rev. C **85**, 047301 (2012).
[17] J.-W. Chen and W. Detmold, Phys. Lett. B **625**, 165 (2005).
[18] R. B. Wiringa, R. Schiavilla, S. C. Pieper, and J. Carlson, Phys. Rev. C **89**, 024305 (2014).
[19] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, Annals Phys. **158**, 142 (1984).
[20] V. Bernard, N. Kaiser, and U.-G. Meissner, Int. J. Mod. Phys. E **4**, 193 (1995).
[21] S. R. Beane, P. F. Bedaque, W. C. Haxton, D. R. Phillips, and M. J. Savage, "From hadrons to nuclei: Crossing the border," in *At The Frontier of Particle Physics* (World Scientific, 2012) Chap. 11, pp. 133–269; S. R. Beane, P. F. Bedaque, M. J. Savage, and U. van Kolck, Nucl. Phys. A **700**, 377 (2002); P. F. Bedaque and U. van Kolck, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **52**, 339 (2002); K. Kubodera and T.-S. Park, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **54**, 19 (2004); E. Epelbaum, H.-W. Hammer, and U.-G. Meißner, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 1773 (2009); H.-W. Hammer, A. Nogga, and A. Schwenk, Rev. Mod. Phys. **85**, 197 (2013).
[22] D. Arndt and M. J. Savage, Nucl. Phys. A **697**, 429 (2002).

[23] J.-W. Chen and X. Ji, Phys. Lett. **B523**, 107 (2001); Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 152002 (2001).

[24] W. Detmold, W. Melnitchouk, J. W. Negele, D. B. Renner, and A. W. Thomas, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 172001 (2001); W. Detmold, W. Melnitchouk, and A. W. Thomas, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 054501 (2002); Phys. Rev. D **68**, 034025 (2003).

[25] W. Detmold and C.-J. D. Lin, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 054510 (2005).

[26] P. Hägler *et al.* (LHPC Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **77**, 094502 (2008).

[27] M. Göckeler *et al.* (QCDSF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 042002 (2004).

[28] S. R. Beane and M. J. Savage, Nucl. Phys. A **761**, 259 (2005).

[29] J.-W. Chen and X. Ji, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 052003 (2002); A. V. Belitsky and X. Ji, Phys. Lett. B **538**, 289 (2002).

[30] J.-W. Chen and I. W. Stewart, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 202001 (2004).

[31] J.-W. Chen, W. Detmold, and B. Smigielski, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 074003 (2007).

[32] S.-i. Ando, J.-W. Chen, and C.-W. Kao, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 094013 (2006).

[33] M. Diehl, A. Manashov, and A. Schäfer, Eur. Phys. J. A **29**, 315 (2006).

[34] T. Mehen, I. W. Stewart, and M. B. Wise, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 931 (1999).

[35] D. B. Kaplan and M. J. Savage, Phys. Lett. B **365**, 244 (1996).

[36] T.-S. Park, D.-P. Min, and M. Rho, Nucl. Phys. A **596**, 515 (1996).

[37] D. B. Kaplan, M. J. Savage, and M. B. Wise, Phys. Lett. B **424**, 390 (1998); Nucl. Phys. B **534**, 329 (1998).

[38] H. Feldmeier, W. Horiuchi, T. Neff, and Y. Suzuki, Phys. Rev. C **84**, 054003 (2011).

[39] A. Rios, A. Polls, and W. H. Dickhoff, Phys. Rev. C **89**, 044303 (2014).

[40] C. Ciofi degli Atti, Phys. Rept. **590**, 1 (2015).

[41] R. Weiss, B. Bazak, and N. Barnea, Phys. Rev. C **92**, 054311 (2015).

[42] R. Subedi, R. Shneor, P. Monaghan, B. D. Anderson, K. Aniol, J. Annand, J. Arrington, H. Benaoum, F. Benmokhtar, W. Boeglin, *et al.*, Science **320**, 1476 (2008).

[43] O. Hen *et al.* (CLAS Collaboration), Science **346**, 614 (2014).

[44] R. J. Furnstahl and H. W. Hammer, Phys. Lett. B **531**, 203 (2002).

[45] R. J. Furnstahl and A. Schwenk, J. Phys. G **37**, 064005 (2010).

[46] J. Carlson, S. Gandolfi, F. Pederiva, S. C. Pieper, R. Schiavilla, K. E. Schmidt, and R. B. Wiringa, Rev. Mod. Phys. **87**, 1067 (2015).

[47] A. Gezerlis, I. Tews, E. Epelbaum, S. Gandolfi, K. Hebeler, A. Nogga, and A. Schwenk, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 032501 (2013).

[48] J. E. Lynn, J. Carlson, E. Epelbaum, S. Gandolfi, A. Gezerlis, and A. Schwenk, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 192501 (2014).

[49] A. Gezerlis, I. Tews, E. Epelbaum, M. Freunek, S. Gandolfi, K. Hebeler, A. Nogga, and A. Schwenk, Phys. Rev. C **90**, 054323 (2014).

[50] I. Tews, S. Gandolfi, A. Gezerlis, and A. Schwenk, Phys. Rev. C **93**, 024305 (2016).

[51] J. E. Lynn, I. Tews, J. Carlson, S. Gandolfi, A. Gezerlis, K. E. Schmidt, and A. Schwenk, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 062501 (2016).

[52] "Two-nucleon densities," `https://www.phy.anl.gov/theory/research/density2/`, accessed: 2016-05-09.

[53] B. S. Pudliner, V. R. Pandharipande, J. Carlson, S. C. Pieper, and R. B. Wiringa, Phys. Rev. C **56**, 1720 (1997).

[54] R. B. Wiringa, V. G. J. Stoks, and R. Schiavilla, Phys. Rev. C **51**, 38 (1995).

[55] S. C. Pieper, V. R. Pandharipande, R. B. Wiringa, and J. Carlson, Phys. Rev. C **64**, 014001 (2001).

[56] E. Epelbaum, H. Krebs, and U. G. Meißner, Eur. Phys. J. A **51**, 53 (2015).

[57] N. Fomin, *Inclusive electron scattering from nuclei at $x > 1$ and high Q^2 with a 5.75 GeV beam*, Ph.D. thesis, Virginia U. (2008), arXiv:0812.2144 [nucl-ex].

[58] J. Seely, A. Daniel, D. Gaskell, J. Arrington, N. Fomin, P. Solvignon, R. Asaturyan, F. Benmokhtar, W. Boeglin, B. Boillat, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 202301 (2009).

[59] W. Detmold, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 054506 (2005).

[60] X. Ji, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 262002 (2013).

[61] H.-W. Lin, J.-W. Chen, S. D. Cohen, and X. Ji, Phys. Rev. D **91**, 054510 (2015).

[62] See, e.g., X. Ji, J. Phys. G **24**, 1181 (1998).

[63] D. W. Higinbotham and O. Hen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 169201 (2015).